

307577

Archives
closed
LD
175
A406
Th
305

THE EFFECT OF COTTAGE PARENT EXPECTANCY ON REINFORCEMENT
ADMINISTERED TO OPPOSITIONAL CHILDREN

A Master's Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
Appalachian State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Clinical Psychology

by
Charles Norman Page
May 1974

THE EFFECT OF COTTAGE PARENT EXPECTANCY ON REINFORCEMENT
ADMINISTERED TO OPPOSITIONAL CHILDREN

by

Charles Norman Page

Approved by

Paul A. Fay

Chairman, Thesis Committee

R. S. Mann

Assistant Professor of Psychology

Bruce L. Bachelder

Assistant Professor of Childhood Ed.

Walter J. Snijders

Chairman, Department of Psychology

B. F. Stuckland

Dean of the Graduate School

Acknowledgements

The writer wishes to thank the members of his thesis committee, Drs. Paul Fox, Robert Maris, and Bruce Bachelder, for their helpful suggestions and criticisms.

Special thanks is extended to Dr. Bachelder for providing equipment, personnel, facilities, and professional advice throughout this endeavor.

Thanks are due also to the staff of Western Carolina Center, Morganton, North Carolina and Murdock Center, Butner, North Carolina for providing research time and subjects. A special word of appreciation is extended to Mr. Cecil Greene who did much to smooth the road to research at Murdock Center.

Abstract

The effect of manipulating expectation of social behavior on the amount of contingent reinforcement delivered by caretakers to a child was investigated.

Forty cottage parents employed at a state institution for the mentally retarded were asked to view a video tape of a 14 year old mildly retarded female engaged in cleanup activities with her peers. The cottage parents were asked to record social, cooperative, and on-task behavior. A 15 second interval recording technique was used. The subjects were asked to consider each check as an occasion for reinforcement of that behavior. The subjects were divided into four groups of 10 subjects each with each group receiving differing information about the child. Group I received oppositional information, Group II received oppositional and special training information, Group III received special training information only, and Group IV received no information other than general procedural instructions.

There was no significant difference in the number of checks recorded by the four groups.

Intensity of expectancy, strict adherence to the task, strict definition of task and behavior were suggested as possible variables effecting the outcome of the study.

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Method	4
Subjects	4
Apparatus and Materials	5
Experimental Design	6
Experimental Conditions	6
Target Behavior	6
Procedure	7
Results	8
Discussion	9
References	12
Appendixes	13
A. Experimental Form	13
B. Instructions--Group I	14
C. Instructions--Group II.	17
D. Instructions--Group III	21
E. Instructions--Group IV.	24
F. Form Letter to Subjects	26
G. Table of Analysis of Variance	27
Vita	28

Introduction

Ora (1971) has defined the oppositional preschooler as a child who, despite a physical capability for cooperation, actively resists what our culture calls reasonable requests. He describes the child as uncooperative and negative, hyperactive, displaying serious temper outbursts, and frequently destructive. The etiology of this behavior is attributed to the parents' differential reinforcement of inappropriate behavior and inattention to appropriate behavior.

The comments of Ora (1971) focused on the oppositional preschooler. The same pattern of strengthening inappropriate behavior may be found among institutional retarded children. Oppositional behavior is a problem in any setting, but is especially troublesome in a live-in institutional setting with a low staff to child ratio. A staff member faced with the responsibility of caring for many children is often unable to devote the time and energy required to deal effectively with an oppositional child. Appropriate behavior is typically ignored, while attention is offered contingent upon disruption. The problem is further compounded by the special circumstances often effecting the retarded child (home environment and pre-institutional experience).

Token systems have done much to facilitate behavioral management in institutional settings (Kazdin and Bootzin, 1972). In order to attain maximal effectiveness with token economies, however, various subject and therapists variables must be considered. Even within the token system inappropriate behavior may be strengthened and appropriate behavior ignored. Time requirements and staff work load often reduce the efficacy of token systems. It is possible that additional measures could increase the efficiency of the system.

Within the context of a token economy, Bachelder and Guyer (1974) conducted research to determine the efficacy of assigned responsibility on the social adjustment of mildly retarded adolescent girls at Western Carolina Center for the Mentally Retarded in Morganton, North Carolina. Selected girls were given responsibility of supervising cottage cleanup. Marked improvement in the girls' social adjustment was evidenced by increases in token bonuses, time on classroom tasks and improvement in rate of performance and accuracy on a tracing task. Reversals in performance concomitant with removal of assigned responsibility indicated that the experimental manipulation contributed to the behavior change.

Recent research has also focused on staff variables which may effect the performance of the institutionalized oppositional child. Feedback from supervisors and co-workers (Panyan, Boozer, and Morris, 1970; and Bricker, Morgan, and Grabowski, 1968), and monetary reward (Loeber, 1971; Bricker et.al., 1968) have been found to be more effective in maintaining staff performance than the performance of their assigned children. The present study was designed to determine the effect of staff expectancy concerning their charges on the amount of reinforcement delivered to those charges.

Rosenthal pointed out the importance of experimenter variables in the laboratory and teacher variables in the classroom with his research in expectancy (Rosenthal, 1966, Rosenthal and Jacobsen, 1968). Rosenthal's work stimulated much interest, the majority of which has been in the area of academics, learning, and laboratory research. If the expectancies of the teacher and scientist do indeed effect the results they obtain when working with other people, it would seem

reasonable that trainer or cottage parent expectancies could effect the outcome of programs dealing with the mentally retarded.

Merchenbaum (1969) found that positive teacher expectancy (expectancy of improved academic performance), both increased the number of positive interactions and decreased the number of negative interactions between the teacher and target students. Grieger (1968) found an increase in positive interactions between the teacher and both experimental and control students when there was an expectancy of improvement in academic performance.

If, in a training situation, positive expectancy on the part of the teacher or trainer increases the number of positive interactions or decreases the number of negative interactions between the subject and trainer, there would be a greater opportunity for positive reinforcement to be administered to the subject.

Recent research has suggested that staff expectancy influences their ability to effectively present reinforcement (Jakubowski, 1968). Jakubowski (1968) demonstrated that when examiners are given reinforcement directions inconsistent with their expectancies, they used contingent reinforcement less accurately than examiners whose instructions were consistent with their expectancy. Two groups of examiners were lead to expect subjects to produce either adult-centered or child-centered stories to a set of thematic cards. Within each examiner group 1/3 was instructed to socially reinforce stories consistent with their expectations, 1/3 was given reinforcement instructions inconsistent with their expectations, and 1/3 was given no reinforcement instructions. Those examiners receiving reinforcement instructions consistent with their expectancies or no instructions were significantly

more accurate in their application of contingent reinforcement. This study suggests a definite expectancy influence on the application of contingent reinforcement.

Zegers (1967), however, found that expectancy did not interfere with the effectiveness of the trainer in dispensing reinforcement contingent upon verbal behavior. It was concluded that the trainers adhered so closely to task instructions that the expectancy or examiner bias effect was unable to operate. Expectancy effects can apparently be reduced by clear definition of the task and perhaps by staff awareness that their performance is being observed.

If positive expectancy on the part of the trainer does bring an increase in performance on the part of the subject and this expectancy phenomenon is mediated by contingent reinforcement, establishment of positive staff expectancy concerning their charges would be expected to bring an increase in the amount of positive reinforcement delivered to those children.

The present study was designed to explore the effect of positive staff expectancy on the amount of positive reinforcement delivered to their charges.

Method

Subjects

The subjects who participated in this experiment were 40 volunteer cottage parents, 17 male and 23 female, employed at a state institution for the mentally retarded. They ranged in age from 20 to 62 years with a mean age of 37.8 years. The subjects' educational level ranged from nine to 14 years with a mean education of 12 years. No subject had received extensive training in behavior modification

techniques. The subjects were currently employed in a caretaker capacity.

Apparatus and Materials

One Concord VTR-600-1 video tape recorder and one Concord MR-700 video tape monitor were used to present a video tape to the subjects.

The video tape was recorded at a state institution for the mentally retarded other than the one at which the experiment took place. A Concord TCM-20 video tape camera, a Concord VTR-600-1 video tape recorder, and a Sony microphone were used to produce the video tape.

The video tape was 23 minutes in length. The first 3 minutes presented a target child engaged in cottage cleanup activities alone. The child was a 14 year old mildly retarded female dressed in distinctive clothing. This initial 3 minute segment was designed to familiarize each subject with the target child. The remaining 20 minutes of the tape presented the target child engaged in cottage cleanup with three female peers. This last section was divided into 1 minute intervals by a voice signal which gave the number of each successive minute. Each 1 minute interval was further divided into 15 second segments by a tone.

Social, cooperative, and on-task behavior of the target child was scored by two practicing PHD level behavioral psychologists using a 15 second interval recording technique. Reliability computation yielded 88 percent agreement between the two psychologists.

Each subject viewed the film in a work area office while seated at an executive desk in a straight chair.

An experimental data sheet (Appendix A) and pencil was provided.

Experimental Design

An independent random groups design was used. Each of the 40 subjects was randomly assigned to one of four treatment groups of 10 subjects each. Subject numbers were drawn from a container and used to assign subjects randomly to treatment conditions.

Experimental Conditions

Detailed instructions for each group are presented in Appendixes B, C, D, and E.

Group I (Oppositional Child Information) was presented a case history which portrayed the target child as extremely oppositional. The child was pictured as a real terror.

Group II (Oppositional Child and Special Training Information) was presented the same case history that Group I received and some additional information about the target child's participation in a special training program. The special training program was described as one which had shown promising results in improving the overall adjustment of oppositional children.

Group III (Special Training Information) was presented the special training information only. They received no background information on the target child.

Group IV (No Information) received only the general experimental instructions. No mention was made of the target child's background or training.

Target Behavior

All groups received detailed instructions in the use of the experimental data sheet and a complete definition of the target behaviors.

The behaviors were defined as follows:

1. Social behavior (S) - Any appropriate social interaction between the target child and other members of the cleanup team. Examples are verbal exchange such as laughter, smiles at other members, and physical contact, such as a pat on the back or an arm around the shoulder. Exceptions are argument or disagreement.
2. Cooperation (C) - Any behavior which would aid another member of the team in performing the cleanup task at hand. Examples are helping turn a mattress, helping make a bed, holding sheets, and bringing supplies to other team members.
3. On-task behavior (O)- Any behavior which contributes to the completion of the task at hand. Examples are any cleanup procedure, such as sweeping, dusting, bed making, mattress turning, and locker washing.

Procedure

At least one day prior to the experiment all volunteers were given a form letter containing a brief description of the task they would be asked to perform and a complete definition of the three target behaviors. The subjects were asked to familiarize themselves with the definitions so that the experiment would go more smoothly. A sample of the form letter is provided in Appendix F.

All subjects participated during their regular working hours. When the subject arrived for the experiment, he was taken to a room separate from that in which the experiment was to take place accompanied by Experimenter one. At this time the subject drew a subject number and received instructions. The subject was then taken to the experiment room and seated no more than two feet from the video tape monitor.

Experimenter two, who was unaware of the group to which the subject was assigned, then reviewed the general instructions and target behavior definitions. The 3 minute familiarization section of the tape was then presented after asking the subject to become accustomed to watching the target child. Key features of the child's dress and appearance were pointed out to prevent confusion when the child was observed with her peers.

The 20 minute experimental section of the tape was then begun. Experimenter two remained at the subject's side for the first 2 minutes of the experimental section to ensure that the subject understood the procedure and to answer any questions pertaining to the performance of the task. The subjects were then left alone to complete the recording.

Each subject used a 15 second interval recording procedure to score social, cooperative and on-task behavior. A check was placed beside the appropriate abbreviation (S, C, and O) in the appropriate block if the target child emitted the behavior at any time during each 15 second segment. The subjects were instructed to consider each check as an occasion for reinforcement of the child.

After viewing the tape each subject was asked not to discuss any aspect of the experiment with other staff members. They were told that the results of the experiment would be made available to them at a future date.

Data sheets were later scored by Experimenter two to determine a total reward score for each subject.

Results

One way analysis of variance failed to reveal significant differences in the number of checks recorded under the four experimental

conditions ($F = .118$, $df = 3/36$, $p > .20$). A summary table of analysis of variance is presented in Appendix G.

Mean scores for the four groups were: Group I, 91.4; Group II, 90.7; Group III, 91.1; and Group IV, 96.4.

Discussion

The present study failed to find significant differences in the number of checks recorded by the cottage parents under the four experimental conditions. If, in fact, the expectancy levels were established and this laboratory experiment can be generalized to the caretaker-child relationship, the results would suggest that the expectancy phenomenon is not mediated by reinforcement conditions. However, there are several considerations which would suggest caution in drawing this conclusion.

There is some question as to whether this experimental condition can be generalized to the actual caretaker-child relationship. Several aspects of the experimental situation were artificial to the extent that they could have effectively influenced the outcome of the study. First, the level of expectancy created by the group instructions could not approximate the expectancy, both positive and negative, which would be created by weeks or months of contact with a child. Statements made to the experimenters by the subjects indicated that the desired expectancy was established but no measure of intensity was used.

Secondly, the question arises as to whether a check on a data sheet is considered a reinforcing act by the staff members. It would seem that a person could be much more objective with check marks than with their personal approval or encouragement.

The strict definition of the task and behavior to be rewarded is contrary to the actual situation. It is possible that the subjects

adhered so closely to the task that all bias or expectancy effects were canceled. This hypothesis was advanced by Zegers (1967) when he failed to obtain predicted expectancy effects.

Another aspect of the experimental situation which differed from the actual cottage environment was the number of children being observed. The caretaker is typically required to attend to more than one child in a given time period. Under these conditions the caretaker's bias or expectancy may be more active.

Finally, in actual work situations cottage parents are not accustomed to being observed by others and having their performance rated. It is felt that this factor has been overlooked in much of the research done in this area. This is a very difficult variable to control but it should be considered.

The present study investigated differences in the amount of reinforcement delivered as a function of staff expectancy. If different expectancy had produced significant differences in the amount of reinforcement delivered, this would not have indicated differences in the accuracy with which the reinforcement was applied. For contingent reinforcement to be effective, it must be applied at the appropriate time for appropriate behavior. It is felt that future research should consider accuracy of reinforcement rather than amount. It is entirely possible that increased positive reinforcement could be applied to inappropriate behavior thus increasing the problem of the oppositional behavior rather than decreasing it.

Future research should also consider the use of a formal measure of expectancy, a more complex task utilizing observation of more than one child, and more effective means of establishing expectancy.

In conclusion, the data from the present study suggests that behavior can be defined and recorded regardless of expectancy. Definition and recording of this behavior does not, however, assure that the observer would respond appropriately in an actual interpersonal situation.

References

- Bachelder, B. L. and Guyer, C. G. The effects of work enrichment on the cooperativeness of oppositional retarded adolescents. Western Carolina Center, 1974, unpublished report.
- Bricker, W. A., Morgan, D., and Grabowski, Jr. Token reinforcement of attendants who work with low functioning children. Abstracts of Peabody Studies in Mental Retardation, 1965-1968, 1968, 4 (2).
- Grieger, R. M. The effects of teacher expectancies on the intelligence of students and the behavior of teachers. Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, 1971.
- Jakubowski, P. A. Expectancy and the effects of consistent and inconsistent social reinforcement. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois) Urbana, Ill.: University Microfilms, 1968, No. 68-12135 1 554858.
- Kazdin, A. and Bootzin, R. The token economy: an evaluative review. Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis, 1972, 5, 343-372.
- Loeber, R. Engineering the behavioral engineer. Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis, 1971, 4, 321-326.
- Merchenbaum, D. H. and Bowers, K. S. A behavioral analysis of teacher expectancy effect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13 (4), 306-316.
- Ora, J. P. Instruction pamphlet for parents of oppositional children. Regional Intervention Project for Preschoolers and Parents, Grant No. OEG-0-9-520320-4535 (618), Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, 1971.
- Panyan, M., Boozer, H. and Morris, N. Feedback to attendants as a reinforcer for applying operant techniques. Journal of Applied Behavioral Analysis, 1970, 3, 1-4.
- Rosenthal, R. Experimenter Effects in Behavioral Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.
- Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectation and Pupils' Intellectual Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.
- Zegers, R. A. Expectancy and the effects of confirmation and nonconfirmation. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois) Urbana, Ill.: University Microfilms, 1967, No. 67-11943 1 555768.

Appendix A
Experimental Form

Personal Data

Do Not Write in this Space

Subject # _____
 Group # _____
 Name _____
 Education _____
 Age _____
 Sex _____
 List any special training in
 behavior modification techniques

15 Second Intervals

Min.	1	2	3	4
1	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
2	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
3	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
4	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
5	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
6	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
7	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
8	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
9	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
10	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
11	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
12	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
13	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
14	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
15	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
16	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
17	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
18	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
19	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O
20	S C O	S C O	S C O	S C O

Appendix B

Instructions--Group I

You have been asked here to participate in an experiment which will yield information to be used in the writing of a Master's Thesis. This is not a test and your performance will be completely confidential. However, it is important to the outcome of the experiment that you do your best.

You will be shown a 20 minute video tape recording of children from a state institution for the mentally retarded engaged in cottage cleanup activity. In the tape there will be one girl in particular that I would like for you to observe. This girl will be shown alone for a short period prior to the main tape to enable you to identify her.

Before we procede I will give you some background information about the child you will observe. The child is a 14 year old moderately retarded female who will be referred to as S. H. The child's father is unknown and the mother abandoned her. S. H. was cared for by the mother's relatives until the Department of Social Services took custody of her at age two. The child was admitted to a state institution for the mentally retarded at age seven after having failed to adjust to six foster homes. The reasons given for her failure to adjust were unco-operativeness, inability to get along with other children, and lack of response to the family situation.

Since entering the state institution the child's record has been one of constant trouble. A review of past reports reveals such actions as hiding from cottage parents, breaking into other girls' lockers, stealing money, wandering away from school and other activities, constant fighting with other children, leading others to misbehave,

attacking cottage personnel, and recently, many reports of promiscuous behavior. Recently she became so agitated over denial of permission to go to the campus canteen that she tore her locker door off and threw it at a cottage parent.

On an "Oppositional Child Checklist" developed by Dr. Bruce Bachelder and Chuck Guyer (1974), this child was rated higher than any other child in their care by staff members who work with her.

Now if you will look at the form I gave you, you will see it is divided into two sections, personal information and experiment. In the experimental section there are 20 lines numbered from one to 20 and labeled minutes. As you watch the tape you will hear a voice give a number each minute which will correspond to one of these lines. Each line is divided into four sections, each of which represents 15 seconds of the minute. Within each section are the letters S, C, and O with a blank to the side. These letters are abbreviations for Social, Cooperative, and On-task behavior. These behaviors will be defined for you before we begin. As you watch the tape I would like for you to check the blank to the side of S, C, or O if that behavior is emitted by the target child at any time during the 15 second section. Check the blank only if that type behavior is emitted by the target child at any time within that 15 second interval. The voice will tell you when to move to the next line or minute.

The behaviors you are looking for are as follows:

1. Social behavior abbreviated "S." This is any appropriate social interaction between the target child and other members of the cleanup team. Examples are verbal exchange, such as laughter, smiles at

other team members, and physical contact such as a pat on the back or arm around the shoulder. Exceptions are argument or disagreement.

2. Cooperation abbreviated "C." Any behavior which would aid another member or members of the cleanup team in performing the cleanup task at hand. Examples are helping turn a mattress, holding a sheet or helping make a bed, and bringing supplies to other members of the team.

3. On-task behavior abbreviated "O." Any behavior which contributes to the completion of the task at hand (cleaning the living area). Examples are dusting, sweeping, bed making, mattress turning, and locker washing.

These are behaviors which we feel should be on a continuous schedule of reinforcement or rewarded each time they occur. Therefore, we would like for you to be especially observant.

Remember the voice will tell the number of the minute and a tone will signal the change of 15 second intervals. Also keep in mind that you are interested only in the behavior of the target child. Check the blank only if the target child emits the behavior at least one time during that 15 second interval and only if you feel that the child is emitting that behavior. Are there any questions? Let's begin.

Appendix C

Instructions--Group II

You have been asked here to participate in an experiment which will yield information to be used in the writing of a Master's Thesis. This is not a test and your performance will be completely confidential. However, it is important to the outcome of the experiment that you do your best.

You will be shown a 20 minute video tape recording of children from a state institution for the mentally retarded engaged in cottage cleanup activity. In the tape there will be one girl in particular that I would like for you to observe. This girl will be shown alone for a short period prior to the main tape to enable you to identify her.

Before we procede I will give you some background information about the child you will observe. The child is a 14 year old moderately retarded female who will be referred to as S. H. The child's father is unknown and the mother abandoned her. S. H. was cared for by the mother's relatives until the Department of Social Services took custody of her at age two. The child was admitted to a state institution for the mentally retarded at age seven after having failed to adjust to six foster homes. The reasons given for her failure to adjust were uncooperativeness, inability to get along with other children, and lack of response to the family situation.

Since entering the state institution the child's record has been one of constant trouble. A review of past reports reveals such actions as hiding from cottage parents, breaking into other girls' lockers, stealing money, wandering away from school and other activities, constant fighting with other children, leading others to misbehave,

attacking cottage personnel, and recently, many reports of promiscuous behavior. Recently she became so agitated over denial of permission to go to the campus canteen that she tore her locker door off and threw it at a cottage parent.

On an "Oppositional Child Checklist" developed by Dr. Bruce Bachelder and Chuck Guyer (1974), this child was rated higher than any other child in their care by staff members who work with her.

Five weeks prior to the making of these tapes S. H. was entered in a special program to give her more responsibility and help her adjust to cottage and institutional life in a more favorable manner. It is felt that this program will improve a child's social adjustment and behavior by giving her more responsibility. This is similar to programs used in industry to improve the performance of capable personnel who show little initiative. S. H. had the duties of the cottage cleanup team and team captain explained to her and was given assistance in understanding these duties when needed. She was then made cleanup team captain. Preliminary studies with other children have shown promising results and it is felt that the program will produce marked changes in S. H.

Now if you will look at the form I gave you, you will see it is divided into two sections, personal data and experiment. In the experimental section there are 20 lines numbered from one to 20 and labeled minutes. As you watch the tape you will hear a voice give a number each minute which will correspond to one of these lines. Each line is divided into four sections, each of which represents 15 seconds of the minute. Within each section are the letters S, C, and O with a blank to the side. These letters are abbreviations for Social, Cooperative, and

On-task behavior. These behaviors will be defined for you before we begin. As you watch the tape I would like for you to check the blank to the side of S, C, or O if that behavior is emitted by the target child at any time during that 15 second section. Check the blank only if that type behavior is emitted by the target child at any time within that 15 second interval. The voice will tell you when to move to the next line or minute.

The behaviors you are looking for are as follows:

1. Social behavior abbreviated "S." This is any appropriate social interaction between the target child and other members of the cleanup team. Examples are verbal exchange such as laughter, smiles at other team members, and physical contact such as a pat on the back or arm around the shoulder. Exceptions are argument or disagreement.

2. Cooperation abbreviated "C." Any behavior which would aid another member or members of the cleanup team in performing the cleanup task at hand. Examples are helping turn a mattress, holding a sheet or helping make a bed, and bringing supplies to other members of the team.

3. On-task behavior abbreviated "O." Any behavior which contributes to the completion of the task at hand (cleaning the living area). Examples are dusting, sweeping, bed making, mattress turning, and locker washing.

These are behaviors which we feel should be on a continuous schedule of reinforcement or rewarded each time they occur. Therefore, we would like for you to be especially observant.

Remember the voice will tell the number of the minute and a tone will signal the change of 15 second intervals. Also keep in mind that you are interested only in the behavior of the target child. Check the

blank only if the target child emits the behavior at least one time during that 15 second interval and only if you feel that the child is emitting that behavior. Are there any questions? Let's begin.

Appendix D

Instructions--Group III

You have been asked here to participate in an experiment which will yield information to be used in the writing of a Master's Thesis. This is not a test and your performance will be completely confidential. However, it is important to the outcome of the experiment that you do your best.

You will be shown a 20 minute video tape recording of children from a state institution for the mentally retarded engaged in cottage cleanup activity. In the tape there will be one girl in particular that I would like for you to observe. This girl will be shown alone for a short period prior to the main tape to enable you to identify her.

Five weeks prior to the making of these tapes S. H. was entered in a special program to give her more responsibility and help her adjust to cottage and institutional life in a more favorable manner. It is felt that this program will improve a child's social adjustment and behavior by giving her more responsibility. This is similar to programs used in industry to improve the performance of capable personnel who show little initiative. S. H. had the duties of the cottage cleanup team and team captain explained to her and was given assistance in understanding these duties when needed. She was then made cleanup team captain. Preliminary studies with other children have shown promising results and it is felt that the program will produce marked changes in S. H.

Now if you will look at the form I gave you, you will see it is divided into two sections, personal data and experiment. In the experimental section there are 20 lines numbered from one to 20 and labeled minutes. As you watch the tape you will hear a voice give a number each

minute which will correspond to one of these lines. Each line is divided into four sections, each of which represents 15 seconds of the minute. Within each section are the letters S, C, and O with a blank to the side. These letters are abbreviations for Social, Cooperative, and On-task behavior. These behaviors will be defined for you before we begin. As you watch the tape I would like for you to check the blank to side of S, C, or O if that behavior is emitted by the target child at any time during that 15 second period. A tone will sound to signal when you are to move to the next 15 second section. Check the blank only if that type behavior is emitted by the target child at any time within that 15 second interval. The voice will tell you when to move to the next line or minute.

The behaviors you are looking for are as follows:

1. Social behavior abbreviated "S." This is any appropriate social interaction between the target child and other members of the cleanup team. Examples are verbal exchange such as laughter, smiles at other team members, and physical contact such as a pat on the back or arm around the shoulder. Exceptions are argument or disagreement.

2. Cooperation abbreviated "C." Any behavior which would aid another member or members of the cleanup team in performing the cleanup task at hand. Examples are helping turn a mattress, holding a sheet or helping make a bed, and bringing supplies to other members of the team.

3. On-task behavior abbreviated "O." Any behavior which contributes to the completion of the task at hand (cleaning the living area). Examples are dusting, sweeping, bed making, mattress turning, and locker washing.

These are behaviors which we feel should be on a continuous schedule of reinforcement or rewarded each time they occur. Therefore, we would like for you to be especially observant.

Remember the voice will tell the number of the minute and a tone will signal the change of 15 second intervals. Also keep in mind that you are interested only in the behavior of the target child. Check the blank only if the target child emits the behavior at least one time during that 15 second interval and only if you feel that the child is emitting that behavior. Are there any questions? Let's begin.

Appendix E

Instructions--Group IV

You have been asked here to participate in an experiment which will yield information to be used in the writing of a Master's Thesis. This is not a test and your performance will be completely confidential. However, it is important to the outcome of the experiment that you do your best.

You will be shown a 20 minute video tape recording of children from a state institution for the mentally retarded engaged in cottage cleanup activity. In the tape there will be one girl in particular that I would like for you to observe. This girl will be shown alone for a short period prior to the main tape to enable you to identify her.

Now if you will look at the form I gave you, you will see it is divided into two sections, personal data and experiment. In the experimental section there are 20 lines numbered from one to 20 and labeled minutes. As you watch the tape you will hear a voice give a number each minute which will correspond to one of these lines. Each line is divided into four sections, each of which represents 15 seconds of the minute. Within each section are the letters S, C, and O with a blank to the side. These letters are abbreviations for Social, Cooperative, and On-task behavior. These behaviors will be defined for you before we begin. As you watch the tape I would like for you to check the blank to the side of S, C, or O if that behavior is emitted by the target child at any time during the 15 second section. Check the blank only if that type behavior is emitted by the target child within that 15 second interval. The voice will tell you when to move to the next line or minute.

The behaviors you are looking for are as follows:

1. Social behavior abbreviated "S." This is any appropriate social interaction between the target child and other members of the cleanup team. Examples are verbal exchange such as laughter, smiles at other team members, and physical contact such as a pat on the back or arm around the shoulder. Exceptions are argument or disagreement.

2. Cooperation abbreviated "C." Any behavior which would aid another member or members of the cleanup team in performing the cleanup task at hand. Examples are helping turn a mattress, holding a sheet or helping make a bed, and bringing supplies to other members of the team.

3. On-task behavior abbreviated "O." Any behavior which contributes to the completion of the task at hand (cleaning the living area). Examples are dusting, sweeping, bed making, mattress turning, and locker washing.

These are behaviors which we feel should be on a continuous schedule of reinforcement or rewarded each time they occur. Therefore, we would like for you to be especially observant.

Remember the voice will tell the number of the minute and a tone will signal the change of 15 second intervals. Also keep in mind that you are interested only in the behavior of the target child. Check the blank only if the target child emits the behavior during that 15 second interval and only if you feel the child is emitting that behavior. Are there any questions? Let's begin.

Appendix F

Form Letter to Subjects

Dear Staff Member:

You have volunteered to take part in an experiment which will be used to provide information for my Master's Thesis. You will be asked to view a 20 minute video tape of children engaging in cottage cleanup and identify three types of behavior on these tapes. Below is a definition of these behaviors and the abbreviation which will be used on the experimental form. Please study these definitions, examples and abbreviations so that you will be completely familiar with them on the day of the experiment.

In approximately one week you will be notified of a time and place to report for the experiment. The procedure will require only about 30 minutes of your time and should not interfere with your work schedule.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. I look forward to meeting you.

Sincerely,

Charles N. Page

The three behaviors are as follows:

1. Social behavior (S) - Any appropriate social interaction between the target child (to be designated) and other members of the cleanup team. Examples: verbal exchange such as laughter, smiles at other team members, physical contact such as a pat on the back or arm around the shoulders. Exceptions are argument or disagreement.
2. Cooperation (C) - Any behavior which would aid another member or members of the cleanup team in performing the cleanup task at hand. Examples: helping turn a mattress, holding a sheet or helping make a bed, bringing supplies to other members of the team.
3. On-task behavior (O) - Any behavior which contributes to the completion of the task at hand (in this case, cleaning of the living area). Examples: any cleaning procedure such as dusting, sweeping, bed making, mattress turning, locker washing.

Appendix G
Analysis of Variance

Source	df	ms	f
Total	39	566.656	
Between Groups	3	71.733	.118*
Within Groups	36	607.883	

*
p > .20

Vita

Charles Norman Page was born on September 14, 1942 in Forest City, North Carolina where he completed his primary and secondary education. After graduating from Cool Springs High School, Forest City, North Carolina in 1960, he entered Gardner Webb Junior College where he completed one year of undergraduate training. He entered the United States Air Force in 1961 and while completing his obligation underwent 12 months intensive Korean Language training at the Institute of Far Eastern Languages, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

He returned to Gardner Webb Junior College in September of 1967 and completed his second year of undergraduate study. In May of 1968 he received the degree Associate of Arts with a concentration in education from Gardner Webb Junior College.

In September of 1971 he again enrolled in Gardner Webb College and completed his undergraduate training. In May of 1972 he received the degree Bachelor of Science with major in psychology.

In September of 1972 he entered Appalachian State University Graduate School and has since been receiving graduate training in Clinical Psychology.